

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 6 is canceled by way of this amendment. Therefore, Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 7 being the only independent claims.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that Claims 7-9 are allowed. Thus, Claims 1-5 are the only claims presently at issue in this application.

Claims 1 and 7 are amended to address minor punctuation issues, without changing the scope of the claims.

Fig. 2 is amended to better show that the numeric identifier --8-- corresponds to the horizontal detector arm.

On the top of page two of the Official Action, an issue is raised regarding the language "a scanning tunnel" in Claim 7. Claim 7 recites that the "scanning tunnel is enclosed by the portal-shaped frame and the conveying device", and that the "portal-shaped frame" is formed "by means of the collimator, the horizontal detector arm and the vertical detector arm", the collimator, horizontal detector arm, vertical detector, and conveying device being identified in Fig. 2. Thus, the "scanning tunnel" is in fact shown in the drawings. Should this issue remain, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned so that this issue may be quickly resolved.

Another issue is raised regarding the recitation in Claim 7 of a "transition means". It is respectfully pointed out that in Fig. 3 a transition roller 102 is identified, thereby addressing this issue.

On the bottom of page two of the Official Action, an issue is raised regarding the recitation of "a floor" in Claim 8. Accordingly, Claim 8 is amended to instead recite --the floor--, thereby addressing this issue.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,758, hereinafter *Krug*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,331,118, hereinafter *Jensen*.

Claim 1 is generally directed to an inspection system having a combination of features including a conveying device that is composed of roller conveyers and a chain-plank conveyer. An idle transition roll is used to smoothly bridge the roller conveyors and the chain-plank conveyer.

*Krug* discloses a device for inspecting baggage and shows, in Figs. 1 and 2, a conveyer 5 for moving the baggage. As shown, the conveyer 5 seems to be of the belt variety and seems to operate alone. Therefore, as recognized on the middle of page four of the Official Action, *Krug* does not disclose a combination of features including an idle transition roll that is used to smoothly bridge roller conveyors and a chain-plank conveyer.

*Jensen* discloses a system for determining the dimensional volume of a package and includes a system for moving the packages. As shown in Fig. 1, this system includes an infeed conveyer 10 of the belt variety and a skewed conveyer 30 positioned adjacent to the infeed conveyer 10. The skewed conveyer 30 is of the roller conveyer variety and forces the packages to one side, causing the packages to ride against fixed vertical guards 23 (column 3, lines 52-55).

To remedy the deficiency of the *Krug* disclosure, the Official Action assumes that *Jensen's* disclosure includes the above noted idle transition roll and that it would

have been obvious to modify *Krug* to include such. However, this is not accurate. *Jensen* does not disclose an idle transition roll that is used to smoothly bridge the roller conveyers and a chain-plank conveyer. *Jenson* discloses a skewed conveyer 30 that forces packages to the side against a guard 23. For at least this reason, neither *Krug* nor *Jensen* disclose or suggest using an idle transition roll for smoothly bridging roller conveyors and a chain-plank conveyer. Should this rejection be maintained, it is requested that it be shown specifically where the cited disclosures show an idle transition roll in combination with the other claimed features.

Another difference between Claim 1 and the cited disclosures is that Claim 1 defines a combination of features including a chain-plank conveyer. On the middle of page 4 of the Official Action, it is stated that the item 345 in *Krug* is a chain-plank conveyer. However, in column 14, line 7 *Krug* identifies the item 345 as being "a belt 345". It is requested that the next Official Action explain how a belt type conveyer discloses a chain-plank conveyer, or that this rejection be withdrawn.

Without the combination of features in claim 1, air cargo could not be stably conveyed from the roller conveyors to the chain plank conveyor. The impact caused by cargo hitting the chain plank conveyor from the roller conveyors would cause vibration of the chain plank conveyor which would impede stable scanning of the cargo.

Claim 1 is also allowable at least because it defines a combination of features including a horizontal detector arm that is supported by an upper end of a collimator. *Krug* does not disclose this feature, and instead shows a detector array 6a being attached solely to the back of the tunnel 8 and the array 6b being solely attached to the top of the tunnel. The collimator 3 seems to be connected to the top of the

tunnel 8, but does not connect to or support either of the arrays 6a or 6b. Therefore, *Krug* does not show a horizontal detector arm that is supported by an upper end of the collimator as defined by Claim 1.

Claims 2-3 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.


The Official Action rejects Claims 4 and 5 based on the disclosures of *Krug*, *Jensen*, U.S. Patent No. 6,28,943B1, hereinafter *Ellenbogen*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,974,111, hereinafter *Krug '111*. None of the cited disclosures remedy the deficiencies of the rejection of Claim 1. Therefore, at least because Claims 4 and 5 depend from Claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the examiner feel that a teleconference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: January 6, 2004

By:   
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

*One replacement drawing sheet is attached, including Fig. 2. The line extending from the numeric identifier --8-- has been extended to better identify the device.*

Attachments: One replacement drawing sheet  
One annotated drawing sheet showing changes

